



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,565	05/08/2001	Bidyut Parruck	AZA-003/2001-P003	3219
293	7590	05/03/2006	EXAMINER	
Ralph A. Dowell of DOWELL & DOWELL P.C. 2111 Eisenhower Ave Suite 406 Alexandria, VA 22314			DUONG, DUC T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/851,565	PARRUCK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Duc T. Duong	2663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-22 and 34-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20-22 and 34-40 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 41 and 44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 42 and 43 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/10/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 41 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dai (US Patent 5,781,549).

Regarding to claim 41, Dai discloses a network device 100 having one or more ports 101-124 (fig. 1), comprising a packet processing unit 200 (memory manager) for storing information (noted the information referred to packet information, which is also cell information) into a memory 210 with buffers of equal size (fig. 3 col. 5 lines 12-23), wherein the packet processing unit 200 included a reassembly means 700 for receiving said information from the memory 210 and for performing one reassembly process per port (fig. 7 col. 10 lines 29-35; noted the linked list control logic 750 maintains one packet transmission line (reassembly process) per port) such that no more than one reassembly context is maintained for each port (fig. 8 col. 10 lines 57-67; a packet attribute 820 (reassembly context is maintained for each port)).

Regarding to claim 44, Dai discloses the reassembly means 700 processes the information with various assembly operations based on the header (type of information), col. 9 lines 46-51.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed January 31, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding to applicant's argument on pages 2-3, Dai fails to teach performing one **reassembly context** per active output port. In response, examiner respectfully traversed applicant's argument. Though examiner agree with applicant the processing unit 200 of Dai discloses 25 assembly lines and thus Dai may not restrict reassembly operations to one **reassembly process** per port. However, examiner would like to point out what applicant claimed and what applicant argued are two different limitations. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **reassembly process or reassembly operation**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The **reassembly context** that applicant claimed has no specific structure or function, and, thus it is given the broadest interpretation. In this instant, the **transmission line** of the processing unit 200 serving each port (col. 10 lines 29-31) in Dai is interpreted as the **reassembly context** applicant claimed and therefore Dai read on the claimed limitation. Based on the reasons set forth here, the rejections are maintained.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 42 and 43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2616

5. Claims 20-22 and 34-40 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record fails to teach or make obvious the step of or means for **“retrieving from the plurality of buffers the data payloads of one of the groups of switch cells destined for each of the output ports, and outputting from the integrated circuit the data payloads retrieved such that a reassembled packet is transmitted onto a fiber optic cable for each of the groups of switch cells retrieved, the reassembled packet of a group comprising the data payloads of the switch cells of the group, the data payloads of no more than one group for each output port being output at any one time”**, when the retrieving is considered within the specific steps of the method recited in claim 20. The prior art of record fails to teach or make obvious the step of or means for **“using the running byte count to reassemble the chunks such that the chunks form a packet, wherein the integrated circuit is usable in an ingress and in an egress mode, wherein in the ingress mode the packet is transferred to a switch fabric, and wherein in the egress mode the packet is transmitted onto a network”**, when such running byte is considered within the specific steps of the method recited in claim 36. The prior art of record fails to teach or make obvious the step of or means for **“a mode control register, wherein placing first configuration information in the mode control register causes the integrated circuit to operate in an ingress mode, and wherein placing second configuration information in the mode control register causes the**

Art Unit: 2616

integrated circuit to operate in an egress mode”, when such mode control register is considered within the specific structure of the device recited in claim 39.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc T. Duong whose telephone number is 571-272-3122. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00 AM-6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy D. Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DD
DD



HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600